

REMARKS

Claims 16, 19, 20 and 22-23 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of March 10, 2004, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11103781A.

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled by the present amendment, so this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by JP 11299422A.

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled by the present amendment, so this rejection is now moot.

Claims 1-10 and 16-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Breillatt, Jr. et al.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1-10 have now been cancelled, and claims 16-21 have been amended. Support for the temperature of 165°C can be found in the specification as filed at Experiment 1 on pages 14-18 of the specification as filed. In particular, Table 1 and the

paragraph bridging pages 17 and 18. The effect of incorporating a substance selected from the group consisting of lipids, carbohydrates, saccharides, polyalcohols and emulsifiers is supported by Experiment 2 on pages 18-22 of the specification as filed, in particular, Table 2. Support for the amendments made to claim 20 can be found in the specification as filed in Example A-5 on pages 26-27 and Example B-1 on page 31 of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 22 can be found in the paragraph bridging pages 3 and 4 and the paragraph bridging pages 4 and 5 of the specification as filed. Support for new claim 23 can be found in Examples B-1 to B-4, and B-14.

Breillatt, Jr. et al. neither disclose a method for lowering the adhesion of a trehalose solution as defined in amended claim 16, nor the thermoplastic shaped body of trehalose in a fiber or cotton-like form as defined in amended claim 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that amended claims 16, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by Breillatt Jr., et al.

Claims 11-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Breillatt, Jr. et al.

The present amendment cancels claims 11-15.
Therefore, this rejection is now moot.

Appln. No. 09/694,677
Amd. dated June 10, 2004
Reply to Office Action of March 10, 2004

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted
that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and
favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By


Anne M. Kornbau
Registration No. 25,884

AMK:msp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\S\SUMA\katagiri3\pto\07JUN04.amd.doc